

multiple crop failures. Given the present state of agriculture, many within the Ag community believe reforming the crop insurance program is the best ways to provide immediate relief for farmers across the country.

Since the introduction of this bill, I have heard from producers and insurance agents across the state of Oklahoma who have been extremely pleased with the provisions of Senator ROBERTS' bill. I believe first and foremost one of the best provisions of this bill is the premium write-downs. Under this legislation, the current subsidy structure is inverted. By doing this we encourage participation at higher levels of coverage. By encouraging participation in the crop insurance program, we strengthen the safety net for America's farmers. While this is a very simple provision, I think this is one of the best provisions in the bill and one of the easiest ways to improve the current state of agriculture.

The Risk management for the 21st Century Act contains provisions which establishes an Average Production history credit program. This addresses the needs of those farmers who lack production histories because they are just beginning or have recently added land. A related provision which helps many of the farmers in Oklahoma is the multi-year disaster Average Production History adjustment for producers who have suffered a disaster during at least three of the preceding five years. This is especially important to our producers in the Southwest who have suffered through several years of drought conditions.

I am also pleased by the Noninsured Assistance program. Under this program, producers are allowed to plant different varieties of a crop and still be considered a single crop. As I heard from the farmers in Boise City, as well as the Ag summit, this is what they wanted—greater freedom and the opportunity to try new things. I am also pleased by the provisions dealing with restructuring the Board of Directors for the Federal Crop Insurance Commission. It is my hope we can fill this Board with producers who are farming on a daily basis and know the crop insurance system.

Mr. President, Danny Geis, President of the Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, noted at the Ag summit, "Policy set forth from now to the end of the current farm bill must culminate in the development of a program that will provide a realistically solid financial floor that will insure stability, and will encourage the opportunistic free enterprise system that makes U.S. agriculture strong." I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the Risk Management for the 21st Century Act as I believe it helps achieve this important goal. It helps producers obtain better coverage at a lower cost, creates a flexible policy that better meets their needs, and it encourages development of policies that ensure against market losses. This plan strengthens the farm safety net

by improving farm and risk management by providing a good step for long-term policy improvements for producers. By making the permanent improvements to crop insurance, we will ensure that farmers and ranchers will have powerful management tools for years to come. Once again, Senator ROBERTS is providing a tremendous voice for farmers across the country and I look forward to working with him to ensure passage of this important legislation.

THE CLOSURE OF NSWC-ANNAPOLIS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I want to speak about the end of an era for the David Taylor Research Center, and the beginning of a promising future for this facility and many of its workers. On September 25, 1999, the Navy will formally close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division's Annapolis Site, more commonly known as the David Taylor Research Center (DTRC). While the Navy marks the occasion of its departure from this successful and accomplished lab, we must not dwell solely on its past. On this occasion we should also recognize the help and cooperation of Anne Arundel County, the Navy, and relevant businesses in developing a reuse strategy that will enable the lab to continue conducting important maritime research into the 21st century.

The Navy has a right to be very proud of the legacy of this lab. I want to touch on a few of its most important contributions throughout our maritime history. From its inception in 1903 by Rear Admiral George Melville, it has served a crucial role in the development of our modern Navy.

First established as the US Naval Engineering Experiment Station (EES), it served to fill the need for the testing of Naval equipment and the development of Fleet standards for Naval machinery. During WWI, the EES assisted the Navy with the procurement of naval machinery, crafting guidelines for optimum fuel usage, developing metal corrosion deterrents, and pioneering the first use of sonar. Before its expansion during WWII, the lab's research on sound led to the development of the first sonic depth and range finders.

In 1941, Dr. Robert Goddard established a Bureau of Aeronautics at the facility which led to the expansion of five additional Naval Laboratories on the site during WWII. The newly expanded Annapolis lab served to make many critical contributions to WWII Naval Fleet development, ranging from high capacity water stills for submarine use to improvements in Marine Corps landing craft.

By 1963, the facility had evolved into one of the Navy's premiere research and development centers, and was renamed the U.S. Marine Engineering Laboratory. During the Vietnam war, the lab provided support to our forces from 1966 until the end of the war. Dur-

ing that time, its projects included boat quieting systems, engine cooling, bunker busting, aluminum boat corrosion abatement, and the development of ferro-cement boats.

During the late 1970s, the work of the Annapolis lab was concentrated into two technical departments, Propulsion and Auxiliary Systems, and Materials Engineering. The lab's contributions to today's Navy range from cutting edge superconducting electrical machinery to patented approaches to isolating and silencing machinery on every submarine class.

In addition to these and other truly remarkable accomplishments, the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division's Annapolis Site has served as the technical training ground for thousands of scientists, machinists, technicians, engineers, and other related lines of employment. It is through their innovation, expertise, and hard work that this facility has been such a critical proving ground for the Navy, and I am proud to say that because of our redevelopment strides, many of these experts will continue their excellent work for the Navy and other customers in Anne Arundel County.

As many of these employees will recall, I fought very hard in 1993 when the Navy recommended that this site be shut down. And I fought again in 1995 when the BRAC Commission made the final decision to close the Annapolis Center. I continue to believe that the decision was unwise, unjustified and failed to take into account the critical capabilities of the highly skilled and experienced team of scientists and engineers who have contributed so much to the Navy over the years.

After the Navy's decision, many of these dedicated scientists and researchers could have walked away and gone to Philadelphia or found jobs elsewhere. However, through reuse ventures such as those of VECTOR Research these individuals have made the best of the situation and worked to convert this unique facility into a maritime R&D park. As these businesses continue to expand their marine customer base, we can envision the park as a focal point for maritime high technology into the next millennium. In fact, this month has seen a major milestone in the site reuse process. As some of you know, DTRC houses a Deep Ocean Simulation Facility which is world class in nature, and is uniquely designed and equipped to evaluate commercial and military machinery targeted for deep ocean environments. I am delighted to say that on September 15th, operation of this complex was officially transferred from the Navy to a private firm. As a result of efforts such as this one, the Navy will also continue to benefit, since a large fraction of this reservoir of essential capability might otherwise have been dispersed or lost. Anne Arundel County's decision to take this approach for reuse and its coordinated and innovative strategy in

this regard, should serve as an example for the nation.

With the spirit of cooperation, and innovative reutilization reflected in this effort, I have no doubt that the DTRC will continue to contribute not only to the maritime high technology sector of Anne Arundel County and the State of Maryland, but also to our nation's technological advancement into the 21st Century.

SHOOTING DOWN THE BANKRUPTCY LOOPHOLE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am very disappointed that the Senate majority leader brought up the bankruptcy reform bill and then immediately filed for cloture on the bill. If this week's cloture motion had passed, debate would have been blocked and relevant amendments designed to reform the bankruptcy system would have been prohibited from being offered.

I was planning to offer an amendment that would have prevented one abuse of the bankruptcy system. My amendment was very straightforward. It would have prohibited manufacturers, distributors and dealers of firearms from discharging debts which are firearm related incurred as a result of judgments against them based on fraud, recklessness, misrepresentation, nuisance, negligence, or product liability.

Currently, under the Bankruptcy Code, such persons and companies are able to evade responsibility and "take advantage of the system." That's what Lorcin Engineering Co., a manufacturer of cheap handguns, told Firearms Business it was doing when it filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in 1996. At the time, Lorcin was one of the chief manufacturers of "Saturday Night Specials" or "junk guns" and in 1998, their inexpensive semiautomatic pistol was number two on the list of guns traced to crime scenes by ATF. Lorcin's low quality guns, which caused innumerable deaths because of their cheap construction and easy availability, were the basis of more than two dozen product liability lawsuits. Once Lorcin decided they could not defend their practices against the multiple liability claims filed against them, they decided to protect themselves by using the bankruptcy system to settle these lawsuits for pennies on the dollar and be exempted from an additional lawsuit filed by the city of New Orleans.

Lorcin was able to evade judgments by filing for bankruptcy, and other manufacturers are lining up in bankruptcy court to follow their lead. Davis Industries, another manufacturer of Saturday Night Specials, has also sought refuge in bankruptcy court, perhaps hoping to dismiss the wrongful-death and personal injury suits filed against them by individuals and the multiple lawsuits filed against them by local governments.

Currently, there are eighteen categories of debt that are nondischarge-

able under the Bankruptcy Code. The Code makes certain debts nondischargeable when there is an overriding public purpose. One specific example is the nondischargeability of debt incurred by a debtor's operation of a motor vehicle while legally intoxicated. This addition to the Bankruptcy Code demonstrates Congress' unwillingness to allow debtors to escape debts created by illegal and improper conduct. Debts for death or personal injury resulting from unsafe firearms and their negligent distribution should also be nondischargeable under the Bankruptcy Code. Like debts incurred by drunk driving, Congress must send a message that it will not permit debtors to escape debts incurred by improper conduct.

I urge the Senate to begin a reasonable debate on bankruptcy reform that truly address the abuses of the system. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article from the New York Times, showing the link between some gun manufacturers and the abuse of the bankruptcy system.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1999]

LAWSUITS LEAD GUN MAKER TO FILE FOR BANKRUPTCY

(By Fox Butterfield)

In the first sign of the impact of the growing number of municipal lawsuits against the gun industry, a well-known manufacturer of handguns has filed for bankruptcy protection, raising concern among city officials across the country that other firearms companies may also use bankruptcy to try to avoid the suits.

The bankruptcy filer, Davis Industries, one of a group of companies in suburban Los Angeles that are controlled by a single family and its friends, produces Saturday night specials, cheap handguns favored by criminals. Davis is one of the 10 largest makers of handguns, and studies have found that its products tend to be characterized by a short "time to crime"—that is, a remarkably brief period between sale and the point at which they show up as weapons used in criminal acts.

In another indication of the pressure created by the municipal lawsuits, Bob Delfay, president of the gun industry's largest trade association, says he plans to propose an unusual conference with senior law-enforcement officials, representatives of the National Rifle Association and executives of gun companies to discuss how the industry and government might curb trafficking by people who buy firearms on behalf of criminals and juveniles.

It is unclear precisely what measures Mr. Delfay, of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, has in mind to stop these so-called straw purchases. But any proposals by the gun companies for greater government regulation or industry self-policing of sales and marketing practices would be a substantial departure from the manufacturers' insistence that they are already sufficiently regulated by thousands of laws.

Only last week, Mr. Delfay's group took over a more conciliatory gun-industry organization, the American Shooting Sports Council, which had been trying to open negotiations with lawyers for some of the cities suing the firearms makers. In an interview, Mr. Delfay insisted that his idea for a con-

ference was not intended to open the way for a settlement.

So far, 22 counties and cities, including Chicago, Los Angeles and Detroit, have sued the gun makers, accusing them of failing to include enough safety devices or negligently marketing their guns in ways that enable criminals and juveniles to buy them. The suits seek damages for extra police and hospital costs resulting from gun violence, but more important, city officials say, they want to force the gun companies to accept greater regulation of the way they design, manufacture and distribute their products.

More cities are expected to file suit soon, and lawyers familiar with the issue say New York is close to becoming the first state to bring such a suit. "If New York comes into this, and there are more suits, at some point soon a critical mass will be reached where the costs alone of defending these suits are going to eat up the gun companies," said John Coale, a lawyer in Washington who is representing New Orleans and several other cities that have sued.

Mr. Coale, one of the Castano Group of lawyers who were active in suing the tobacco industry—the group is named for a friend of several of them who died of a tobacco-related disease—estimated that the cigarette companies had spent \$600 million a year defending themselves against the states. "The gun companies simply can't afford it," he said, since they are so much smaller and sales of guns have been flat or declining for a decade.

"So if you get too many cities and states suing," Mr. Coale said, "the manufacturers will go into bankruptcy protection. And the day that happens, the suits stop and it is lose-lose for everybody."

Davis Industries, of Chino, Calif., filed for bankruptcy reorganization in the Federal bankruptcy court in nearby Riverside on May 27, said Alan Stomel, a lawyer who represented creditors in the unrelated 1996 bankruptcy of Lorcin Engineering, another of the gun makers controlled by the same owners as Davis Industries and known as the Ring of Fire companies (because their locations form a ring around Los Angeles).

"Bankruptcy is a very useful negotiating tool," Mr. Stomel said, "and predictably the more suits that are filed, the more these gun companies are going to file for bankruptcy."

A spokesman for Davis Industries, who declined to give his name, confirmed that the company had filed for bankruptcy. "We do what we got to do" in response to the suits, the spokesman said. "I'm sure other companies will do the same thing."

Mr. Stomel said Davis Industries faced several problems: the municipal lawsuits, wrongful-death and personal-injury suits by individuals, a messy argument between the two owners, Jim and Gail Davis, who were recently divorced, and a bill that is expected to pass the California Legislature that would bar the manufacture of cheap handguns.

A lawyer for one of the cities suing the gun makers said bankruptcy "is going to be a huge pain" because it will require much more time and expense for the cities, limit the amount of damages they may collect and, perhaps most important, put the litigation in Federal bankruptcy court. Bankruptcy judges, the lawyer said, are more likely to act favorably to the gun companies than urban juries in state courts.

But Paul Januzzo, general counsel for Glock Inc., one of the largest handgun makers, said it was unlikely that the older, more established, mostly Eastern firearms companies would turn to bankruptcy.

"We are confident we can win the suits, if we have a number of companies litigating together," Mr. Januzzo said.

Lawsuits, he added, are nothing new to the industry. "It would be an unusual gun company that doesn't have a dozen lawsuits a year against it," he said. "This is America."